Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-G200-1 Short Proposal Title: Canal Habitat Restoration

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. The objective is to protect and restore Canal Ranch and the hypotheses is that conservation management practices (restoration, wildlife-friendly farming) will benefit fish and wildlife populations.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

No. The conceptual model does not address specific processes, impacts, or stressors. No explanation is given on how the modification of agricultural practices benefits splittail and delta smelt.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. This is a straightforward acquisition proposal.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

No. This is a 3,070-acre full-scale implementation project. Two tasks are outlined in this proposal: an appraisal of the ranch, and the acquisition of the property. No justification is given as to what will be demonstrated and who is the audience.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

No. The only decision that will be made based on the information generated from this proposal is to withdraw or move forward with the acquisition.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

This proposal is to fund Phase IIIA and IIIB of the implementation plan. The applicant described a monitoring program that will begin in Phase IV of the project. No funds are identified in the budget for monitoring activities.

2 b) Are data	collection,	data ma	nagement,	, data a	analysis,	and re	eporting	plans	well-desc	ribed,
sci	entifically	sound and	adequat	te to meet t	the pro	posed ol	bjectiv	es?			

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion No data will be collected in this phase of the implementation plan.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion Yes.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Yes. It is not stated in the qualifications section but the applicant does point out that the Wildlife Conservation Board will take the lead on the appraisal.

Miscellaneous comments

This proposal is very well organized. It is concise, direct, and to the point.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

The applicants are building a project that has all of the components of success: wetland and

		The applicants are building a project that has an of the components of success. Wetland and
		riparian restoration, wildlife-friendly farming, and the reversal of subsidence through natural
		processes. They are also bringing together a team of specialists who have the experience and
		technical expertise to implement the project. Unfortunately, the project is not ready to fully fund
		at this time. Before CALFED commits \$12,000,000 for three years, the applicant needs a
		completed appraisal and a signed purchase agreement. To keep the project moving forward
		\$15,265 should be awarded to complete the appraisal (Phase IIIA). After the landowner and
		DF&G have reached agreement on the sale contract this proposal could be resubmitted for the
		next round of funding.
	Excellent	
	Very Good	
	Good	
	Fair	
$\overline{\Box}$	Poor	
_	1 001	